



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/707,471	12/16/2003	Rajesh Chawla	SYB/0093.01	1470
31779	7590	06/14/2007		
JOHN A. SMART 708 BLOSSOM HILL RD., #201 LOS GATOS, CA 95032-3503			EXAMINER LOVEL, KIMBERLY M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2167	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/707,471	Applicant(s) CHAWLA ET AL.	
	Examiner Kimberly Lovel	Art Unit 2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the Amendment filed 28 March 2007.
2. Claims 1-55 are pending. Claims 1, 22 and 40 are independent. In the Amendment filed 28 March 2007, claims 1, 6, 10, 21, 22, 26, 30, 39, 40, 44 and 55 were amended. This action is made Final.
3. The rejections of claims 1-55 as being anticipated by US PGPub 2003/0093436 to Brown et al have been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. The rejections of claims 21-39 and 55 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter are withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2003/0093436 to Brown et al (hereafter Brown) in view of US PGPub 2005/0044164 to O'Farrell et al (hereafter O'Farrell).**

Referring to claim 1, Brown discloses a method for performing database operations on data obtained from a web service, the method comprising:

creating at least one proxy table in a database, each proxy table mapping to a method of the web service [creating a virtual table representative of the web service] (Brown: see [0062]-[0063] and [0074]);

in response to a database operation on a particular proxy table, converting the database operation into a format for invoking a particular method of the web service based upon the corresponding mapping (Brown: see [0049]);

invoking the particular method of the web service (Brown: see [0057]-[0059]);

converting results obtained from invoking the particular method into data for use at the database based upon the corresponding mapping (Brown: see [0074]); and

performing the database operation on the data at the database to generate a result set (Brown: see [0075]-[0077], lines 1-2); and

returning the result set in response to the database operation (Brown: see [0075]-[0077], lines 1-2).

However, Brown fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations of generating meta data about the mapping and storing the meta data in a database table of the database and using the meta data for converting the database operation into a format for invoking a particular method of the web service based upon the corresponding mapping. O'Farrell discloses using web services to retrieve data from multiple enterprise data stores (see [0012]), including the further limitations of generating meta data [metadata 312] about the mapping and storing the meta data in a database table of the database (see [0074], lines 8-12 and Fig 3) and using the meta data for converting the database operation into a format for invoking a particular method of the web service based upon the corresponding mapping (see [0076]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the mapping structure of O'Farrell with the method of Brown by replacing the DADX files with the mapping structure. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide a form of automation, which yields significant savings and efficiencies (O'Farrell: see [0005]).

Referring to claim 2, the combination of Brown and O'Farrell (hereafter Brown/Farrell) discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the web service comprises a service remotely available via a network [Internet] (see [0011], lines 5-6).

Referring to claim 3, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the web service has a Web Services Description Language (WSDL) interface (Brown: see [0032], lines 1-7).

Referring to claim 4, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 3, wherein said creating step includes creating said at least one proxy table based upon the WSDL interface (Brown: see [0062]-[0063] and [0074]).

Referring to claim 5, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 3, wherein said creating step includes substeps of:

obtaining the WSDL interface from the web service (Brown: see [0032], lines 1-7); and

creating said at least one proxy table based upon the WSDL interface (see [0062]-[0063] and [0074]).

Referring to claim 6, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said creating step includes creating meta data [i.e., business name] identifying a particular method of the web service to be invoked when a database operation is received on a particular proxy table (Brown: see [0033], lines 9-12).

Referring to claim 7, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said creating step includes mapping arguments of the method [XML elements and attributes] to fields of the proxy table [column names] (Brown: see [0047]).

Referring to claim 8, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said creating step includes mapping arguments of the method [XML elements and attributes] to equivalent database data types [SQL data types] (Brown: see [0047]).

Referring to claim 9, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said creating step includes creating an object encapsulating the mapping of a web method to the database [mapping file 37] (Brown: see [0045]).

Referring to claim 10, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said creating step includes storing the mapping between said at least one proxy table and methods of the web service [mapping file 37] (Brown: see [0045]).

Referring to claim 11, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 10, wherein said step of converting results includes consulting the mapping for converting the results into data for application at the database [mapping file 37] (Brown: see [0045]).

Referring to claim 12, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the database operation includes a JOIN operation and said step of performing the database operation includes joining data obtained from invoking the particular method of the web service with data stored in the database in generating the result set (Brown: see [0105]).

Referring to claim 13, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said step of converting the database operation includes binding data from the database operation to a Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) call for invoking the particular method of the web service (Brown: see [0029] and [0039]).

Referring to claim 14, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said step of converting the database operation includes converting data from the database operation into Extensible Markup Language (XML) format [XML document] (Brown: see [0088], lines 12-15).

Referring to claim 15, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said step of converting the database operation includes creating a Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) request for invoking the particular method of the web service (Brown: see [0030], lines 1-4).

Referring to claim 16, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 15, wherein said step of invoking the particular method includes transmitting the SOAP request to a remote web service [service external to the database] (Brown: see [0011], lines 1-4 and [0030], lines 1-4).

Referring to claim 17, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said step of invoking the particular method includes receiving results from the web service (Brown: see [0075]-[0077]).

Referring to claim 18, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said step of converting results includes converting results received in Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) format (Brown: see [0030], lines 1-4).

Referring to claim 19, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said step of converting results includes converting results received in Extensible Markup Language (XML) format (Brown: see [0014]; [0026]; and Fig 2).

Referring to claim 20, Brown/Farrell discloses a computer-readable medium having processor-executable instructions for performing the method of claim 1 (Brown: see [0023], lines 6-8 and [0024]).

Referring to claim 21, Brown/Farrell discloses a downloadable set of processor-executable instructions for performing the method of claim 1 stored on a web server (Brown: see [0023], lines 6-8; [0024] and [0025], lines 3-4).

Referring to claim 22, Brown discloses in a computer connected to a network and having access to a remote service, a system for performing operations at a database on data obtained from the remote service, the system comprising:

a mapping module for creating database tables representing at least some methods of a remote service accessed through a defined interface [creating a virtual table representative of the web service] (Brown: see [0062]-[0063] and [0074]);

an invocation module for converting a database operation on a database table representing a method of the remote service into a call for invoking the method (Brown: see [0049] and [0057]-[0059]);

a communication module for transmitting the call for invoking the method to the remote service, and returning result values from invoking the method to the database (Brown: see [0011], lines 1-4; [0030], lines 1-4 and [0075]-[0077], lines 1-2); and

a conversion module for converting result values received from the method into database format (Brown: see [0074]).

However, Brown fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations of storing mapping data regarding methods of the remote service in a database system table and using the mapping data. O'Farrell discloses using web services to retrieve data from multiple enterprise data stores (see [0012]), including the further limitations of storing mapping data regarding methods of the remote service in a database system table (see [0074], lines 8-12 and Fig 3) and using the mapping data (see [0076]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the mapping structure of O'Farrell with the system of Brown by replacing the DADX files with the mapping structure. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide a form of automation, which yields significant savings and efficiencies (O'Farrell: see [0005]).

Referring to claim 23, Brown/Farrell discloses the system of claim 22, wherein the remote service comprises an application available via a network [Internet] (Brown: see [0011], lines 5-6).

Referring to claim 24, Brown/Farrell discloses the system of claim 22, wherein the defined interface comprises a Web Services Description Language (WSDL) interface (Brown: see [0032], lines 1-7).

Referring to claim 25, Brown/Farrell discloses the system of claim 24, wherein said mapping module creates the database tables based on the WSDL interface (Brown: see [0062]-[0063] and [0074]).

Referring to claim 26, Brown/Farrell discloses the system of claim 22, wherein said mapping module creates meta data identifying a particular method of the remote service to be invoked when an operation is received on a given database table (Brown: see [0033], lines 9-12).

Referring to claim 27, Brown/Farrell discloses the system of claim 22, wherein said mapping module maps arguments of a method [XML elements and attributes] to columns of a database table [column names] (Brown: see [0047]).

Referring to claim 28, Brown/Farrell discloses the system of claim 22, wherein each database table created by the mapping module represents a method of the remote service [service external to the database] (Brown: see [0011], lines 1-4 and [0030], lines 1-4).

Referring to claim 29, Brown/Farrell discloses the system of claim 22, wherein said mapping module creates an object [mapping file 37] encapsulating the mapping of a method of the remote service to a database table (Brown: see [0045]).

Referring to claim 30, Brown/Farrell discloses the system of claim 22, further comprising: a mapping repository [database 29] for storing mappings between database tables and methods of the remote service (Brown: see Fig 3).

Referring to claim 31, Brown/Farrell discloses the system of claim 30, wherein the conversion module consults the mapping repository for converting result values into database format (Brown: see [0075]-[0077], line 2).

Referring to claim 32, Brown/Farrell discloses the system of claim 22, wherein the operation received on the database table comprises a JOIN operation and said conversion module joins result values obtained from invoking the method with data stored in the database (Brown: see [0105]).

Referring to claim 33, Brown/Farrell discloses the system of claim 22, wherein said invocation module binds the data from the operation to a Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) call for invoking the method of the remote service (Brown: see [0029] and [0039]).

Referring to claim 34, Brown/Farrell discloses the system of claim 22, wherein said invocation module converts data from the database operation into Extensible Markup Language (XML) format (Brown: see [0014]; [0026]; and Fig 2).

Referring to claim 35, Brown/Farrell discloses the system of claim 22, wherein said invocation module creates a Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) request for invoking the method of the remote service (Brown: see [0030], lines 1-4).

Referring to claim 36, Brown discloses the system of claim 35, wherein said communication module sends the SOAP request to the remote service [service external to the database] (Brown: see [0011], lines 1-4 and [0030], lines 1-4).

Referring to claim 37, Brown/Farrell discloses the system of claim 22, wherein said conversion module converts result values received in Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) format into database data types [mapping XML elements and attributes into SQL data types] (Brown: see [0047]).

Referring to claim 38, Brown/Farrell discloses the system of claim 22, wherein said conversion module converts result values received in Extensible Markup Language (XML) format into database data types [mapping XML elements and attributes into SQL data types] (Brown: see [0047]).

Referring to claim 39, Brown/Farrell discloses the system of claim 22, wherein said conversion module provides converted result values in response to the operation on the database table (Brown: see [0075]-[0077], line 2).

Referring to claim 40, Brown discloses in a database system, a method for performing database queries on data available from an application, the method comprising:

establishing communication between a database and an application having an interface (Brown: see [0026], lines 1-7 and [0032], lines 1-3);

creating database tables to represent at least some functions of the application based on the interface, each database table corresponding to a function of the application [creating a virtual table representative of the web service] (Brown: see [0062]-[0063] and [0074]);

in response to a database query received on a database table corresponding to a function of the application, generating input arguments [input parameters] expected by the function based on the database query (Brown: see [0049]);

invoking the function with the input arguments and receiving results from invoking the function (Brown: see [0057]-[0059]);

converting the results into a database result set (Brown: see [0074]); and

returning the database result set in response to the database query [the statement returns a table containing the response from the supplier] (Brown: see [0075]-[0077], lines 1-2).

However, Brown fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations of generating meta data about the mapping and storing the meta data in a database table of the database and using the meta data for converting the database operation into a format for invoking a particular method of the web service based upon the corresponding mapping. O'Farrell discloses using web services to retrieve data from multiple

enterprise data stores (see [0012]), including the further limitations of generating meta data [metadata 312] about the mapping and storing the meta data in a database table of the database (see [0074], lines 8-12 and Fig 3) and using the meta data for converting the database operation into a format for invoking a particular method of the web service based upon the corresponding mapping (see [0076]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the mapping structure of O'Farrell with the method of Brown by replacing the DADX files with the mapping structure. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide a form of automation, which yields significant savings and efficiencies (O'Farrell: see [0005]).

Referring to claim 41, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 40, wherein the application comprises a web service (Brown: see [0026], lines 1-7).

Referring to claim 42, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 40, wherein the application comprises a service available via a network [Internet] (Brown: see [0011], lines 5-6).

Referring to claim 43, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 40, wherein the interface comprises a Web Services Description Language (WSDL) interface (Brown: see [0011], lines 5-6).

Referring to claim 44, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 40, wherein said step of creating database tables includes creating meta data [i.e., business name]

identifying a particular function to be invoked when an operation is received on a given database table (Brown: see [0033], lines 9-12).

Referring to claim 45, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 40, wherein said step of creating database tables includes mapping arguments of a given function [mapping arguments of the method which include XML elements and attributes] to columns [column names] of the corresponding database table (Brown: see [0047]).

Referring to claim 46, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 40, wherein said step of invoking the function includes binding data from the database query to a Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) call (Brown: see [0029] and [0039]).

Referring to claim 47, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 40, wherein said step of invoking the function includes converting data from the database query into Extensible Markup Language (XML) format [XML document] (Brown: see [0088], lines 12-15).

Referring to claim 48, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 40, wherein said step of invoking the function includes creating a Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) request for invoking the function (Brown: see [0030], lines 1-4).

Referring to claim 49, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 48, wherein said step of invoking the function includes transmitting the SOAP request to a remote server [service external to the database] (Brown: see [0011], lines 1-4 and [0030], lines 1-4).

Referring to claim 50, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 40, wherein said step of invoking the function includes receiving results in Extensible Markup Language (XML) format (Brown: see [0014]; [0026]; and Fig 2).

Referring to claim 51, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 40, wherein said step of invoking the function includes receiving results in Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) format (Brown: see [0030], lines 1-4).

Referring to claim 52, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 40, wherein said step of converting the results includes converting results received in Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) format (Brown: see [0030], lines 1-4).

Referring to claim 53, Brown/Farrell discloses the method of claim 40, wherein said step of converting the results includes converting results received in Extensible Markup Language (XML) format (Brown: see [0014]; [0026]; and Fig 2).

Referring to claim 54, Brown/Farrell discloses a computer-readable medium having processor-executable instructions for performing the method of claim 40 (Brown: see [0023], lines 6-8 and [0024]).

Referring to claim 55, Brown/Farrell discloses a downloadable set of processor-executable instructions for performing the method of claim 40 (Brown: see [0023], lines 6-8; [0024]; and [0025], lines 3-4).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-55 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Contact Information


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly Lovel whose telephone number is (571) 272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kimberly Lovel
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

7 June 2007
kml


JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100